

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-49 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-49 stand rejected. No claims have been allowed. No claims have been canceled, amended or added herein.

### **I. Specification**

The abstract of the disclosure has been objected to because it is more than 150 words in length. Appropriate amendments have been made to the abstract herein to reduce its length to less than 150 words, and it is believed that this objection has been obviated thereby.

### **II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, and 14-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by PCT Patent Publication No. WO 01/37163 A1 to Abboud et al. (“Abboud”). In particular, it appears that Abboud is assumed to teach a gaming machine, with the Office Action also stating, “Abboud also discloses a master game controller . . . [and] the gaming machine comprises a monolithic tabletop that encloses the player interfaces (page 4:12-15).” Applicants respectfully traverse.

In order to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each and every element of that claim. Independent claims 1 and 8 both recite, *inter alia*, “a gaming machine.” Applicants respectfully submit that Abboud does not teach a gaming machine. As understood by those skilled in the art, a “gaming machine” is a wager based device adapted to administer and present games of chance based upon wagers, whereupon monetary payouts may be provided to players based upon various game outcomes. The devices of Abboud appear to be little more than ordinary computers, and Abboud neither discloses nor suggests that any of its computers are adapted to administer and present a wager based game. As such, Abboud does not anticipate either of claims 1 or 8 for at least this reason. Because each of claims 2-3, 5, 7,

9-10, and 14-15 all depend from claim 1 or 8, each of these claims is also not anticipated by Abboud for at least the same reason.

In addition, independent claim 1 and dependent claim 9 further recite, “a master gaming controller.” As in the case of the term “gaming machine” above, those of skill in the art would understand the term “master gaming controller” to refer to a specialized master control processor for use with a wager based gaming machine. Because Abboud does not teach or suggest that its devices are adapted to administer and present wager based games, Abboud does not include such a master gaming controller. As such, Abboud does not anticipate either of claims 1 or 9 for at least this additional reason. Because each of claims 2-3, 5, and 7 all depend from claim 1, each of these claims is also not anticipated by Abboud for at least this same reason.

Furthermore, independent claim 1 also recites, “a master gaming controller connected to each of the two or more display screens *in a manner allowing the master gaming controller to control games presented on each of the two or more display screens*” (emphasis added). Assuming, *arguendo*, that the CPS 17 of Abboud could be a master gaming controller, nothing in Abboud suggests that one CPS 17 is adapted to control games presented on multiple display screens. The only multiple display screen embodiment of Abboud is shown and described with respect to its FIG. 7. In describing this embodiment, Abboud states, “The displays 9 *and each of their accompanying central processing system 17* may be networked together” (emphasis added). Abboud at page 12, lines 20-22. Accordingly, Abboud does not teach or suggest “a master gaming controller connected to each of the two or more display screens in a manner allowing the master gaming controller to control games presented on each of the two or more display screens.” As such, Abboud does not anticipate claim 1 for at least this additional reason. Because each of claims 2-3, 5, and 7 all depend

from claim 1, each of these claims is also not anticipated by Abboud for at least this same reason.

Still further, independent claim 8 recites, “a monolithic tabletop provided . . . in a manner covering [various input/output devices] whereby player interaction with [these I/O devices] is via the monolithic tabletop, thereby isolating [these I/O devices] from environmental contamination.” Abboud does not disclose or suggest such a monolithic tabletop. Rather, Abboud discloses a tabletop 1 having a display 9, various input devices 11 and various output devices 13. Although Abboud indicates that its various input and output devices may individually include “a water-proof, water-resistant or water-tight enclosure” (e.g., Abboud at page 8, lines 2-16), each of these items is separate, and there is no teaching or suggestion in Abboud that a single monolithic tabletop covering such devices collectively is provided. As such, Abboud does not anticipate claim 8 for at least this additional reason. Because each of claims 9-10 and 14-15 all depend from claim 8, each of these claims is also not anticipated by Abboud for at least this same additional reason. Furthermore, dependent claim 7 also recites a similar monolithic tabletop, and thus is not anticipated by Abboud for this same additional reason.

For at least each of the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that Abboud does not anticipate any of claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, and 14-15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the pending § 102 rejections of these claims.

### **III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 4, 6, 11-13 and 16- 41 all stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 4, 16-21, 23-32 and 36- 41 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Abboud in view of PCT Patent Publication No. WO 02/099479 A2 to Minami (“Minami”). Claims 6 and 13 stand rejected over Abboud in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0177109 to Storch

(“Storch”). Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected over Abboud alone. Claims 22 and 33-35 stand rejected over Abboud in view of Storch. Claims 42-49 stand rejected over Abboud in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0031321 to Mages (“Mages”) and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0046555 to Bradley et al. (“Bradley”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Each of independent claims 23, 42 and 49 recite the providing or presenting of a game of chance on a gaming machine. In particular, claim 23 recites “wherein the master gaming controller is configured to present a game of chance,” claim 42 recites the process step “presenting a game of chance,” and claim 49 recites, “A method of providing a game of chance on a gaming machine.” None of the rejections of any of these claims deals with these material claim limitations regarding providing or presenting a game of chance on a gaming machine. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 23, 42 and 49 fail for at least this reason. Because claims 24-41 and 43-48 depend from claims 23 and 42, the rejections of these claims fail for at least this same reason as well. Applicants also note that no detailed basis for rejection has been provided with respect to claims 23-32, such that the rejections of these claims are inappropriate for at least this additional reason.

With respect to claims 4 and 16-22, the Office Action states, “It would be obvious . . . to modify Abboud in view of Minami to provide an image redirect sheet upon the display screens.” Applicants respectfully submit that for such a combination of references to be proper, there must be some suggestion or motivation in the references themselves to modify a reference or combine reference teachings. *See, e.g.*, MPEP § 2143. However, no motivation to make such a combination or modification has been shown to lie in the prior art itself. Accordingly, the rejections of claim 4 and 16-22 are improper for at least this reason.

With respect to claims 11 and 12, the Office Action states, “Abboud discloses the use of a monolithic tabletop.” Similar to the rejections above, Applicants respectfully traverse,

and submit that Abboud does not disclose a monolithic tabletop as disclosed and claimed in the present case. Again, the monolithic tabletop as claimed covers various input and output devices at the table surface, while Abboud teaches various input and output devices at its table surface that may use separate water-proof protections. This does not amount to a monolithic tabletop. Furthermore, there must be some suggestion or motivation in the reference itself to modify the reference. *See, e.g.*, MPEP § 2143. Nothing in Abboud itself suggests that its plastic tabletop should be made of glass, or should have a thickness of ½ inch, which is relatively thick compared to many plastic tabletop surfaces. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 11 and 12 are improper for at least these reasons.

With respect to claims 42-49, the Office Action combines Abboud, Mages and Bradley in making the pending rejections. Applicants respectfully submit that for such a combination of references to be proper, there must be some suggestion or motivation in the references themselves to combine reference teachings. *See, e.g.*, MPEP § 2143. However, no motivation to make such a combination has been shown to lie in the prior art itself. Accordingly, the rejections of claim 42-49 are improper for at least this reason, in addition to the reasons provided above.

## **CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in proper form and condition for patentability, and request a Notification of Allowance to that effect. It is believed that no fees are due at this time. Should any fee be required for any reason related to this paper or this application in general, however, then the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fee or fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0388, referencing Docket No. IGT1P089. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below with any questions or concerns relating to this application.

Respectfully Submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER LLP

Date: April 3, 2007

/justinwhite/  
Justin A. White, Esq.  
Reg. No. 48,883

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(408) 255-8001